Corporation for National and Community Service
2010 Social Innovation Fund
Local Initiatives Support Corporation
Reviewer Comments – Phase 2

Applicant Name: Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)

Application ID#: 10SI116349

SOCIAL INNOVATION FUND 2010 EVALUATION CONSENSUS FORM

PROGRAM DESIGN (45%)

Provide a panel assessment of the application's PROGRAM DESIGN as follows:

- Write a brief Narrative Assessment;
- List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and
- Select a Rating for this section.

Panel Narrative Assessment

The applicant proposes a major expansion of a program model, Financial Opportunity Centers, which is designed to improve the financial bottom line for low- to moderate-income families through three key strategies: employment placement, increasing access to income supports, and financial coaching to help families with debt, credit issues and asset building. The model is operating in four cities and the application is to support expansion to five additional cities around the country. They supported the initial pilot and have already supported successful replication in three additional cities and now have a five-year track record of implementing, evaluating and improving the model – and achieving notable results. The applicant's subgranting process is strong, and subgrantees are provided with substantial training, TA, and learning supports and are held accountable for their performance. The use of data, research and evaluation is sophisticated and embedded in the program design.

Significant Strengths

- + The applicant's program model Financial Opportunity Centers (FOC) and theory of change are research based and clearly articulated. Measurable outcomes for improvement, both short-and long-term, are clearly specified (e.g., long-term outcomes measured over 1-3 years include job retention and changes in net income and credit scores). (*Program Design, A.ii*).
- + The proposed impact evaluation is highly rigorous and methodologically sound, involving a quasi-experimental design with two comparison components (comparing FOC clients to similar employment seekers and to data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation). The research design will allow for causal inference. (*Program Design*, *B.i*).
- + Criteria for selecting subgrantees are designed to identify organizations that are committed to the program model, have strong capacity for collection and use of data, and have the ability to quickly address performance issues. Continued funding of subgrantees hinges on compliance (two subgrantees were defunded for failing to meet target outcomes), so there is a high degree of accountability (*Program Design*, *D.i*).

Applicant Name: Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) Application ID#: 10SI116349 The applicant provides substantial TA and training to each new subgrantee to help ensure that they fully understand the FOC model and services as well as performance expectations. Training (webinars, on-site), technology (e.g., ETO), and ongoing support are used to ensure collection of high-quality data for measuring client outcomes, monitoring program implementation, and making mid-course corrections. Subgrantees report quarterly on outcomes, and applicant staff help them use these data to inform program management. All of these practices, along with opportunities for cross-subgrantee learning, help preserve model integrity and improve program quality, which in turn facilitate successful replication and expansion. (Program Design, D.i. and + Beyond program direction, evaluation, and learning, the applicant provides comprehensive hightouch capacity building through the Family Income & Wealth Building program, which has the experience and tools to address all operational needs to replicate and expand the FOC (i.e., training, coaching, data support and fundraising). (Program Design, D.ii) Significant Weaknesses

٦	N T	٠		_
	V	O	m	e

Select a Rating for Program Design (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

Excellent

☐ Strong

Satisfactory

Weak/Non-responsive

ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (35%)

Provide a panel assessment of the application's Organizational Capacity as follows:

- Write a brief Narrative Assessment;
- List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and
- Select a Rating for this section.

Panel Narrative Assessment

The applicant's overall organizational capacity is quite strong: the organization has deep and longstanding experience with evaluation, both internally and externally, as well as experience with scaling up model programs. They use data in a sophisticated way for everything from impact measurement to subgrantee monitoring and organizational assessment. The applicant clearly has the capacity to carry out the proposed program expansion.

Significant Strengths

+ The applicant has 17 years of experience with federal grants management and a proven track record in replication and expansion of model programs, including FOCs. After supporting

	cant Name: <u>Local Initia</u> cation ID#: <u>10SI116</u>		<u>atio</u> n (LISC) —–			
	multiple pilot FOC successfully suppo	sites in one city in orted replication in t	2005 and refining the ahree additional cities. (model over two years, the applic Organizational Capacity, A.i.)	cant	
+	internal division re development and in	esponsible for incorp	porating research and e e organization also wor	five years, the applicant has had valuation into all program ks with top notch research	d an	
+	The applicant has a history of using sophisticated systems, processes, and tools for training and supporting multiple sites and partners, as well as concrete and explicit criteria and mechanisms for holding grantees accountable. (Organizational Capacity, A.ii.)					
. +	impressive. The us convenings of subsefficient: learning i	e of data, technolog grantees all contribu	y (e.g., ETO software) te to a learning enviror to continually refine the	ata, nationally and locally, is training, capacity building, and ament that is both cost effective he model and improve	l and	
Signif	ficant Weaknesses			77%		
	None.	·			×	
Cala -4	t a Dating for Onc.					
Select	a Kaung for ORGA	NIZATIONAL CAPA	CITY (double-click in the	applicable box and select "checke	<u>:d"</u>)	
Select	Excellent	NIZATIONAL CAPA	CITY (double-click in the	applicable box and select "checke	<u>ed"</u>)	
Cos	Excellent TEFFECTIVENE de a panel assessme	☐ Strong	Satisfactory SET ADEQUACY (2)	□Weak/Non-responsive		
Cos Provid	Excellent TEFFECTIVENE de a panel assessme vs: Write a brief Narr List the Significan	Strong ESS AND BUDG Int of the application rative Assessment; t Strengths and Wity or Application	Satisfactory SET ADEQUACY (2) On's Cost-Effective	□Weak/Non-responsive 20%) NESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY: our comments by referencing	as	
Cos Provide follow	Excellent TEFFECTIVENE de a panel assessme /s: Write a brief Narr List the Significan applicable Eligibil	Strong ESS AND BUDG Int of the application rative Assessment; t Strengths and Wity or Application this section.	Satisfactory SET ADEQUACY (2) On's COST-EFFECTIVE Teaknesses (annotate y	□Weak/Non-responsive 20%) NESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY: our comments by referencing	as	
Cos Provid follow Panel The ov Mobility	Excellent TEFFECTIVENE de a panel assessme s: Write a brief Narr List the Significan applicable Eligibil Select a Rating for Narrative Assessme erall budget appears co ty Corporation is sizab	Strong ESS AND BUDG Int of the application rative Assessment; t Strengths and Wity or Application this section. ent ost-effective and adequale but necessary for the	Satisfactory SET ADEQUACY (2) On's COST-EFFECTIVE (eaknesses (annotate y Review Criteria); and quate. The budget allocati	Weak/Non-responsive 20%) NESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY and comments by referencing to the following the Economic possed. Significant resources are	as	

Applic	cant Name: <u>Local Initiat</u> cation ID#:10SI116	ves Support Corpora 349	tion (LISC)	
+	The applicant has be support for grantee	oudgeted adequately s. (Cost-Effectivene.	for evaluation as well ass and Budget Adequac	as for training, TA, and ongoing y, A.ii.)
Signi	ficant Weaknesses			
	None.			
Select	t a Rating for Cost- lect "checked")	Effectiveness an	ND BUDGET ADEQUACY	(double-click in the applicable box
	Excellent	⊠ Strong	Satisfactory	Weak/Non-responsive
		OVERA	LL APPRAISAL	
single power (3) the potent demor capaci subgra provise expans progra position accour implements account improvements account ac	model, (2) evaluation ful for increasing fame outcomes for improviate for high, demonstrated their capacity ty to carry out the productes are strong as artions to ensure programsion. Their experiences in management and noted to implement who had to implement who had the effect of t	research has demonity economic security economic security ement are clearly stable impact. Not on to replicate and expoposed expansion. The their use of training integrity and qualty with and use of evenake mid-course contact they have proposed fectiveness of their tely, to show successecurity.	instrated that combining ity than the additive effective and measurable of the pecified and measurable of the applicant's criteria and it, giving great continuity, which are the necessaluation and more generated in the proposed measure on the proposed measure on the proposed measure of the pro	surable outcomes regarding
	Band II (Strong): A	and no/minimal sig	mificant weaknesses. lemonstrates overall con	n of excellent merit with very mpetence and is worthy of
	Band III (Satisfactor	alue of the significa	nt strengths outweigh t	he identified weaknesses.

- 1 1	T)	1 AY						
<u> </u>	no/minimal sig	mificant stre	ngths that hav	ve been id	entified.	very significant wea . This option may a	iknesses and ilso include ar	1
		•	•					
	(
								•
			•					
	•							
								٠
		-			•		·	
				•				
			•					
						7%		
		-		•	•			
		•	1					
						•		
	•						1.09	,
							•	
	•	*						
					-			
							·	
	•							
	4							
	•							
		•	•					•
**						•		
				<i>2</i> *				
• •								
	•			•				100
						•		
				•				